



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tion there has been considerable dispute, it being asserted on the one hand that his Christian father had married a Spanish Jewess, and to this was to be ascribed his evident predilection for Hebrew ideas. Documentary evidence of his birth is wanting, but M. Chauviré points out that Bodin's affection for the Old Testament is of slow development, that as author of the *Method of Historical Study* at the age of thirty-six he is clearly a Christian, and that his favorable views of Judaism appear chiefly in the *Colloque* written at the end of his life. The tradition seems to have resulted from an attempt in later time to explain the presence of these unpopular and heretical leanings. It is clear that in early youth he enjoyed the friendship and protection of eminent members of the clergy, and that throughout his life he conformed to the established religion.

In tracing the intellectual attitude of Bodin the author draws copiously from the *Colloque*. As to which of the characters in that work stood for the writer's own opinions there has also been extensive controversy. Equally accused of being Solomon the Jew, Toralba the advocate of natural religion, or Senamy the devotee of all the gods that are, the guilt of any one of these would make him a dangerous enemy of society in the sixteenth century. He was suspected of sympathy with the Protestant movement and was marked for persecution with its followers. At the same time, while conforming outwardly to the government which gave him official position, he was composing a treatise which invoked the toleration of all religions under the shadow of St. Bartholomew.

In discussing the sources of Bodin's *Republic* the author touches upon the great authorities in political science whose traces can be found in the work, from Aristotle to Calvin and his contemporaries. That he made use of the records of the States General and was familiar with a great quantity of the pamphlet literature of his day is equally evident, and this chapter lends valuable suggestion for the study of opinion in this period. To fit into the politics of that time the scientific views of this great theorist is a more difficult task, for the determination of the extent of their influence in his lifetime is elusive, but toward this end this book has made a conspicuous advance.

J. M. VINCENT.

*The Institution of the Archpriest Blackwell: a Study of the Transition from Paternal to Constitutional and Local Church Government among the English Catholics, 1595 to 1602.* By JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S. J. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1916. Pp. x, 106.)

MOST of the books on the Archpriest Controversy have been written from the secular point of view; Father Pollen's volume therefore adds definitely to the literature on the subject a conspicuously moderate,

though brief, narrative, written from the Jesuit point of view, but without any reflection of the rancor of the disputants from which none of the accounts written from the secular angle have been entirely free. He insists that acrimonious personalities were then and still remain beside the point. To him the real subject is "the establishment of a form of Church government" and to that "all else was secondary". The second Appeal is for him therefore a study in legislation rather than a judicial inquiry: the real object of the hearings at Rome was the discussion of the adequacy of a previous analysis of the English Roman Catholic situation and the consequent value of an administrative expedient already adopted to meet it. The significance of the final decision of the pope lay not in the affirmation of the interpretation by the appellants of the Constitutive Letters or in the censure of Blackwell and the interdiction of close relationship with the Jesuits, but in the decision of the pope to continue the missionary form of organization and in the confirmation of Blackwell's tenure of the office of archpriest. In describing the events leading to the issuance of the Constitutive Letters, Father Pollen holds that the decision to appoint an archpriest was reached by the pope himself independently of the Jesuits, for Parsons and the leading English Jesuits favored an episcopal organization. He hints (p. 23) that the Seculars made no consistent attempt to present to pope and curia in 1597 their arguments in favor of a bishop. By this and by other statements he implies that the opposition to the office of archpriest rose entirely after its institution and was the result of Blackwell's personal deficiencies and of the sixteenth-century tempers of all concerned.

This is of the utmost importance. If the office of archpriest was created in the teeth of Jesuit opposition, obviously the interpretation of the Constitutive Letters by the appellants and their subsequent defenders was and is a purely gratuitous inference, a reading into them what was not meant to be there, and resulted rather from the tactless conduct of Blackwell than from any intention of the Jesuits to retain control of Roman Catholic organization in England. Indeed, the Seculars are thus represented as quarrelling with the only Catholic authorities who agreed with them in desiring a bishop. Their opposition to the Jesuits becomes at once foolish, illogical, inexpedient, and wrong. Their assumption that the pope himself was not responsible for the Letters was an error of the first magnitude. Father Pollen has handled the subject definitely and temperately, but this conclusion is none the less strongly enforced.

It is perhaps surprising that he deals with this really crucial point in a few casual sentences (p. 25) and assumes its proof as an easily demonstrable fact rather than demonstrates it. He quotes no corroboratory evidence and merely refers in his foot-notes to some of the well-known papers, used by all previous writers, as if their meaning was beyond dispute. His willingness to dispense with conclusive evidence on so essential a point is the more astonishing because he sees clearly that hearsay evidence is not enough to convict Parsons of anything beside indiscretion

in his treatment of the first appellants in 1598 (p. 43). As a matter of fact, is it not uncritical to assume that because the English Jesuits can be shown to have discussed in their letters the question of episcopal organization and because Parsons had before him schemes for the introduction of bishops, that he and his order actually argued with the pope in favor of bishops and against the archipresbyterate in 1597? The Seculars at the time undoubtedly believed the contrary; the conduct both of Blackwell and of Garnet scarcely agrees with such an interpretation; the letter of Parsons to Garnet quoted in Usher's *Reconstruction of the English Church*, I. 182, from the original in Stonyhurst Archives, is hardly compatible with such a view. Does not this evidence raise a presumption too definite to be disposed of so casually and without the production of new evidence?

Father Pollen has made elaborate researches in the archives at the Vatican, at Simancas, at Brussels, and at Paris without discovering information of importance. Material considerable in amount but mainly corroborative and illustrative of what was already demonstrated from other sources he found in various collections but chiefly in the archives of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Nevertheless, the amount of new material utilized is not important and Father Pollen's account has retold the story with different emphasis rather than changed it.

ROLAND G. USHER.

*A Political and Social History of Modern Europe.* By CARLTON J. H. HAYES, Associate Professor of History in Columbia University. In two volumes. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1916. Pp. xxvi, 597; ix, 767.)

THE plan of these volumes springs from a special conception of the requirements of a college course in modern European history. Professor Hayes feels that the collegian is often fed "so simple and scanty a mental pabulum that he becomes as a child and thinks as a child". To piece out or amplify the brief general statements of many texts by means of supplementary reading, without leaving bewildering gaps, is, he believes, next to impossible. He has, therefore, not shrunk from producing a text-book in two volumes, aggregating thirteen hundred pages, with statements sufficiently full on many topics to reduce the need of further reading, or, at least, to change the problem. His choice of facts and manner of exposition are clearly suited to the intellectual maturity of older college students and of the reading public beyond university walls.

A second feature of the plan is the emphasis upon recent times. Although the volumes portray four centuries of European development, they give about five-twelfths of the space to the period since 1867. The point of view is predominantly social, because the rise of the bourgeoisie is confessedly "the great central theme". Another main interest appears in the titles of parts IV. and V., "Democracy and Nationalism"